

### REMARKS

Claims 1-5, and 7-9 are pending herein. Claims 1-5 have been amended. Claim 6 has been cancelled. Claims 7-9 have been added.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 5, acknowledgment of priority under 35 USC § 120, and consideration of the references cited in Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement as evidenced by the signed and returned PTO Form-1449.

1. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, but has been clarified by this amendment. Claim 5 was objected to for an informality which has been cured by this amendment. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection and rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Wellman. Claim 1 as amended recites a filtering means for, *inter alia*, "matching a set of defined fault signals including impulsion peaks." This limitation is not taught by Wellman, so the § 102 rejection may not be properly maintained.

The Office Action identified Wellman filter capacitor 119 and resistor 114 as corresponding to the filtering means of Applicants' claim 1. In Wellman, filter capacitor 119 charges through resistor 114 and discharges through a combination of resistor 114 and resistor 118. Filter capacitor 119 therefore operates in a non-linear manner with a longer discharge time compared to its charging time. Consequently, these filler components operate in a peak detection mode but do not match impulsion peaks as recited in Applicants' claim 1 as amended. By way of non-limiting example, the identified Wellman components do not match the truncated

sinusoids shown in Figures 4D and 4E of the instant application, as those impulsion peaks would generate an unacceptably large detection error in Wellman.

Thus, Wellman fails to disclose a filtering means “matching a set of defined fault signals including impulsion peaks” as recited in Applicants’ claim 1 as amended. In addition, the focus of Wellman on the operating by peak detection of the signal teaches directly away from other forms of detection. As such, Wellman does not teach or suggest a filtering means having the matching characteristic recited in Applicants’ claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinct over Wellman. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

3. Claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wellman. For at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1, claims 2 and 3 are patentably distinct over Wellman. Claim 3 has been amended to clarify “a signal rectifier” to “the rectifying means,” “amplifier” to “rectifying means,” and “control means” to “processing means.” Claim 3 is now definite and satisfies the statute. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2 and 3 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

4. Claim 4, which depends from claim 1, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wellman in view of Katz. Katz does not provide what is lacking from Wellman, *i.e.*, a filter means having the matching characteristic as recited in Applicants claim 1 as amended. For at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1, claim 4 is likewise patentably distinct over Wellman and Katz. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 and allowance of the same are therefore requested.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Wellman. Claim 6 has been cancelled, thereby mooted the rejection.

Claims 7-9 have been added to further define that which Applicants regard as their invention. No new matter has been added.

Please note that any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, that have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art should be considered to have been made for clarity, a purpose unrelated to patentability. This includes all amendments to claims 2 and 4, as well as any amendments to claims 1, 3, and 5 which were not specifically discussed herein as responsive to any rejection or objection.

Accordingly, the application is now in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would be of value, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293 (Order No. 28954.1416).

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP



Roger W. Parkhurst, Reg. No. 25,177  
Scott D. Watkins, Reg. No. 36,715

Date: May 18, 2005

1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: 202-429-3000  
Fax: 202-429-3902